75-369

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
SEP 8 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

in the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

NO. _____, MISC.

WILLIAM BUCOLO, RONALD SIMPSON and JAMES R. AGUT,
Petitioners,

vs.

JAMES ADKINS, CHIEF JUSTICE, JOSEPH BOYD, B. K. ROBERTS, BEN OVERTON and ARTHUR ENGLAND, JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA, and DONALD P. KOHL, JUDGE OF THE PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA CIRCUIT COURT, CRIMINAL DIVISION,
Respondents.

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS, PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS, AND BRIEF IN SUPPORT THEREOF

ALFRED I. HOPKINS
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
1701 Meridian Avenue
Miami Beach, Florida 33139

ALLAN B. EVERARD
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
1207 Harvey Building
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

RICHARD YALE FEDER
and
IRMA ROBBINS FEDER
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
110 N. Hibiscus Drive
Miami Beach, Florida 33139

Attorneys for Petitioners

MIAMI REVIEW — 371-4853 — 377-3721

INDEX

	Page
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS	1
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND BRIEF IN SUPPORT THEREOF	3
OPINIONS BELOW	3
JURISDICTION	4
QUESTION PRESENTED	4
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED	4
STATUTE INVOLVED	5
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	5
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	7
PRAYER	7

INDEX TO APPENDIX

	Page
Florida Supreme Court Mandate, July 29, 1975	App. 1
Florida Supreme Court Opinion, July 9, 1975	App. 2
Florida Supreme Court Opinion in *Fontana* case, July 9, 1975	App. 5
Supreme Court of the United States Order, April 21, 1975	App. 7
Florida Supreme Court "Corrected Opinion", December 9, 1974	App. 8

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Case	Page
Bucolo v. State, 303 So.2d 329 (Fla. 1974), reversed 43 U.S. Law Week 3571 (#74-857), April 21, 1975, reversed and remanded ___So.2d___ (Fla. 1975)	3, 6
Fontana v. State, ___So.2d___ (Fla. 1975)	7
Jenkins v. Georgia, 418 U.S. 157 (1974)	5-7
Kois v. Wisconsin, 408 U.S. 229 (1972)	6, 7
Miller v. California, 413 U.S. 15 (1973)	4, 6-8
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS	
United States Constitution, First Amendment	4
United States Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment	4
STATUTES	
Title 28, U.S.C.A., Sec. 1651	4, 5
Florida Statute, Sec. 847.011	5

in the

Supreme Court

of the

United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

NO. _____, MISC.

WILLIAM BUCOLO, RONALD SIMPSON and JAMES R. AGUT,

Petitioners,

vs.

JAMES ADKINS, CHIEF JUSTICE, JOSEPH BOYD, B. K. ROBERTS, BEN OVERTON and ARTHUR ENGLAND, JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA, and DONALD P. KOHL, JUDGE OF THE PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA CIRCUIT COURT, CRIMINAL DIVISION,

Respondents.

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Petitioners respectfully move this Court for leave to file the Petition for Writ of Mandamus hereto annexed;

and further move that an Order and Rule be entered and issued directing the Honorable Supreme Court of Florida, and the Honorable Chief Justice James Adkins, and the Honorable Justices Joseph Boyd, B. K. Roberts, Ben Overton and Arthur England, and the Honorable Palm Beach County, Florida Circuit Court, Criminal Division, and the Honorable Donald P. Kohl, Judge of the Palm Beach County, Florida, Circuit Court, Criminal Division, to show cause why a Writ of Mandamus should not be issued against them in accordance with the prayer of said Petition and why your Petitioners should not have such other and further relief in the premises as may be just and meet.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD YALE FEDER and
IRMA ROBBINS FEDER
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
110 N. Hibiscus Drive
Miami Beach, Florida 33139

ALFRED I. HOPKINS
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
1701 Meridian Avenue
Miami Beach, Florida 33139

ALLAN B. EVERARD
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
1207 Harvey Building
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401
Attorneys for Petitioners

DATE — SEPT. _____, 1975.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA, AND THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE JAMES ADKINS AND JUSTICES JOSEPH BOYD, B. K. ROBERTS, BEN OVERTON AND ARTHUR ENGLAND OF THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA AND THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONALD P. KOHL OF THE PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA CIRCUIT COURT, CRIMINAL DIVISION, AND BRIEF IN SUPPORT THEREOF

Petitioners pray that a Writ of Mandamus issue to review the Judgment of the Supreme Court of Florida entered in the above entitled cause on July 9, 1975, and made "final" under said Court's rules upon expiration of time to file Petition for Rehearing on July 24, 1975, and the Mandate of said Court dated July 29, 1975.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Supreme Court of Florida dated July 9, 1975 is reported at _____ So. 2d _____ and printed in the Appendix hereto.

The initial "corrected opinion" of the Supreme Court of Florida dated December 9, 1974 is reported at 303 So.2d 329 and the Order of the Supreme Court of the United States dated April 21, 1975 granting certiorari and reversing said Judgment is reported at 43 U.S. Law Week 3571. Both are printed in the Appendix hereto, along with the Supreme Court of Florida's Mandate to the Florida Circuit Court dated July 29, 1975.

JURISDICTION

The Judgment of the Florida Supreme Court was entered July 24, 1975, when the time expired to file rehearing petition under the Florida Rules (i.e., 15 days after the filing of the Opinion on July 9, 1975), and the Mandate thereon issued on July 29, 1975. This Court's jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C.A., Sec. 1651 on the ground that the Florida Supreme Court's Judgment and Mandate violate this Court's April 21, 1975 Order and Mandate in the case at bar.

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the Florida Supreme Court's reversal of the obscenity convictions below *accompanied by remand* "to the trial Court for further proceedings in which the standards established in *Miller v. California* can be applied" violates the Order and Mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case at bar.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides, in part:

> "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press . . . "

The Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides, in part:

> ". . . No State shall . . . deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . . "

STATUTE INVOLVED

Title 28, U.S.C.A., Section 1651 provides, in part:

> "(a) The Supreme Court . . . may issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law . . ."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. By "corrected opinion" dated December 9, 1974 the Florida Supreme Court affirmed Petitioners' convictions of violation of the Florida obscenity statute, Sec. 847.011, over Petitioners' attack on "the constitutionality of the statute vel non *and as applied to* both *the materials involved* and as applied to each of them" (303 So.2d 329 at 330, emphasis added, Appendix infra).

2. Petitioners' Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Florida (filed January, 1975, Case No. 74-857) again raised the same contentions along with a challenge to the extraordinary delay in decision below (over four years after oral argument before the Florida Supreme Court). The four allegedly obscene items, the Captain Cretin Comic Strip, the T.V. Comic-Strip, the Art Work Picture, and the Ink Blot Picture were printed in the Appendix to the Petition at pp. App. 24, 25, 26 and 27. (They were also attached to the Application for Stay granted by the Honorable Associate Justice Lewis F. Powell by Order dated January 6, 1975.) In addition, copies of the two issues of the 1968 *Florida Free Press* in which the four allegedly obscene items appeared were forwarded to this Court. Petitioners' Petition cited *Jenkins v.*

Georgia, 418 U.S. 153 (1974) and *Kois v. Wisconsin*, 408 U.S. 229 (1972), *inter alia*, in support of the proposition that "The Florida Obscenity Statute was unconstitutionally applied to the newspaper comic-strips and pictures involved." (Petition, pp. 16-19).

3. On April 21, 1975, this Court handed down the following Order:

> "74-857 Bucolo v. Florida. The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted and the judgment is reversed. Jenkins v. Georgia, 418 U.S. 157 (1974) and Kois v. Wisconsin, 408 U.S. 229 (1972)."

4. On July 9, 1975, the Florida Supreme Court handed down an opinion in which this cause was not simply reversed but ". . . remanded to the trial court for further proceedings in which the standards applied in *Miller v. California* can be applied". On July 29, 1975 the Court's Mandate to the trial Court to hold further proceedings in accordance with said opinion followed.

5. The relief sought herein is unavailable in any other Court as only this Court can enforce its Order of reversal and Mandate thereon so as to free Petitioners from the "further proceedings" ordered by the Florida Supreme Court and thus prevent a trial *de novo* on the issue of the criminal obscenity of items already held constitutionally protected by this Court's opinion in this cause.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The clear import of this Court's reversal of the Judgments below, citing the *Jenkins* and *Kois* cases, is that the allegedly obscene items in question come within the protection of the First and Fourteenth Amendments as a matter of constitutional fact and law, cannot be prescribed as hardcore pornography, and cannot support Judgments of conviction.

The Florida Supreme Court's opinion below, incorporating its *Fontana v. State* opinion by reference (Appendix, infra), totally ignores the clear import of this Court's reversal. For the trial court below to hold "further proceedings in which the standards established in *Miller vs. California* can be applied" would subject Petitioners herein to a valueless second trial extremely prejudicial to them under all of the circumstances involved.

This Court has already held that Petitioners' convictions cannot stand under the Constitution since the items in question are constitutionally protected. Only this Court can prevent a second trial, contrary to this Court's Order and Mandate herein.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Petitioners pray:

1. That a Writ of Mandamus issue from this Court directed to the Honorable Supreme Court of Florida, and the Honorable Chief Justice James Adkins, and the Honorable Justices Joseph Boyd, B. K. Roberts, Ben Overton and Arthur England of the Supreme Court of Florida, and the Honorable Palm Beach County, Florida Circuit Court,

Criminal Division, and the Honorable Donald P. Kohl, Judge of the Palm Beach County, Florida Circuit Court, Criminal Division, to show cause on a day to be fixed by this Court why Mandamus should not issue from this Court directing said Justices and Judge to vacate and expunge from the record the Opinion of the Florida Supreme Court dated July 9, 1975 and the Mandate dated July 29, 1975, requiring further proceedings in which the standards established in *Miller v. California* can be applied.

2. That Petitioners have such additional relief and process as may be necessary and appropriate in the premises.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD YALE FEDER and
IRMA ROBBINS FEDER
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
110 N. Hibiscus Drive
Miami Beach, Florida 33139

ALFRED I. HOPKINS
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
1701 Meridian Avenue
Miami Beach, Florida 33139

ALLAN B. EVERARD
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
1207 Harvey Building
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401
Attorneys for Petitioners

By _____
IRMA ROBBINS FEDER

APPENDIX

MANDATE
SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

To the Honorable, the Judges of the Circuit Court, Criminal Division, in and for Palm Beach County, Florida

WHEREAS, in that certain cause filed in this Court styled:

WILLIAM BUCOLO VS. STATE OF FLORIDA
RONALD A. SIMPSON VS. STATE OF FLORIDA
JAMES R. AGUT VS. STATE OF FLORIDA
WILLIAM BUCOLO and JAMES R. AGUT VS. STATE OF FLORIDA

Case No. 38,280, 38,279, 38,278, 38,424

Your Case No. 68M3538

The attached opinion was rendered on July 9, 1975,

YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED that further proceedings be had in accordance with said opinion, the rules of this Court and the laws of the State of Florida.

WITNESS the Honorable James C. Adkins Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Florida and the Seal of said Court at Tallahassee, the Capital, on this 29th day of July, 1975.

/s/ Sid J. White

Clerk of the
Supreme Court of Florida.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA,
JULY TERM, A.D. 1975

CASE NO. 38,280
WILLIAM BUCOLO,

Appellant,

v.

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Appellee.

CASE NO. 38,279
RONALD A. SIMPSON,

Appellant,

v.

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Appellee.

CASE NO. 38,278
JAMES R. AGUT,

Appellant,

v.

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Appellee.

CASE NO. 38,424
WILLIAM BUCOLO and JAMES R. AGUT,

Appellants,

v.

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Appellee.

CIRCUIT COURT CASE NO. 68M3538

Opinion filed July 9, 1975

Appeals from the Circuit Court, Criminal Division, in and for Palm Beach County, Donald P. Kohl, Judge

Richard Yale Feder; Irma Robbins Feder; Alfred I. Hopkins and Allan V. Everard, for Appellants

Earl Faircloth, Attorney General; and Raymond L. Marky, Assistant Attorney General, for Appellee

BOYD, J

These cases are before us pursuant to a mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States,[1] decided May 20, 1975, reversing a decision of this Court.[2]

In these consolidated appeals Appellants originally contested their convictions of violation of Section 847.011, Florida Statutes, commonly referred to as the Florida obscenity statute. The trial court having held that statute to be constitutional, Appellants challenged that ruling in their direct appeal to this Court; we upheld the judgment of the trial court based on our recent decision in *Papp v. State*,[3] *inter alia*, which had become final before the cases of *Hamling*[4] and *Jenkins*[5] were called to our attention.

---

[1]Styled: William Bucolo, Ronald A. Simpson and James R. Agut v. Florida, Case No. 74-857.

[2]*Bucolo v. State*, 303 So.2d 329 (Fla. 1974).

[3]298 So.2d 413 (Fla. 1974).

[4]*Hamling v. United States*, 418 U.S. 87, 94 S.Ct. 2887, 41 L.Ed.2d 590 (1974).

[5]*Jenkins v. Georgia*, 418 U.S. 153, 94 S.Ct. 2751, 41 L.Ed.2d 642 (1974).

After this Court's decision *sub judice* was rendered, Appellants filed their petition for writ of certiorari with the United States Supreme Court, which granted the petition. Having considered this cause in light of *Jenkins*[6] and *Kois v. Wisconsin*,[7] that Court reversed this Court's holding and remanded the case for further proceedings.

Accordingly, in view of this Mandate and in light of our recent holding in *Fontana v. State*, Case No. 41,937, opinion filed July 9, 1975, this cause is reversed and remanded to the trial court for further proceedings in which the standards established in *Miller v. California*[8] can be applied.

It is so ordered.

ADKINS, C.J., ROBERTS, OVERTON and ENGLAND, JJ., Concur

---

[6]Id.

[7]408 U.S. 229, 92 S.Ct. 2245, 33 L.Ed.2d 312 (1972).

[8]413 U.S. 15, 93 S.Ct. 2607, 37 L.Ed.2d 419 (1973).

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA,
JULY TERM, A.D. 1975

CASE NO. 41,937
Circuit Court Case No. 187311

JOSEPH GEORGE FONTANA and
DAVID M. CRICHTEN,
Appellants,

vs.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
Appellee.

Opinion filed July 9, 1975

An Appeal from the Circuit Court in and for Hillsborough County, I. C. Spoto, Judge

Joel Hirschhorn, for Appellants

Robert L. Shevin, Attorney General; and Raymond L. Marky, Assistant Attorney General, for Appellee

BOYD, J.

An information was filed against Appellants on March 18, 1970, and they were each convicted by a jury in the Magistrate's Court of Hillsborough County on six counts of violation of Section 847.011, Florida Statutes, in the sale of obscene magazines. Appellants were each fined $1,000.00 and sentenced to serve three months in the Hillsborough County jail. Appellants appealed to the Hillsborough County Circuit Court from an order deny-

ing both a motion in arrest of judgment and a motion for new trial. Thereafter, the Appellee moved to dismiss the appeal on several grounds, one of which was lack of jurisdiction because the trial court passed on the constitutionality of Section 847.011, Florida Statutes. The Hillsborough County Circuit Court denied the motion to dismiss on three grounds but treated the jurisdictional ground as a motion to transfer under Rule 2.1a(5)(d), Florida Appellate Rules; the court then granted the motion and transferred the cause to this Court.[1]

We recognize that the federal Supreme Court in *Hamling v. United States*[2] once again applied retrospectively the standards established in *Miller v. California*[3] to federal statutes, while in *Jenkins v. Georgia*,[4] that Court announced the rule that defendants whose convictions were on direct appeal at the time of the *Miller* decision should receive any benefit available to them thereunder, making no distinction between federal and state convictions for distributing obscenity.

The first *Miller* standard was initially enunciated in *Roth v. United States*[5] and was reaffirmed in the "Memoirs" opinion;[6] that standard is whether the average person, applying contemporary community standards, would find that, when taken as a whole, the magazines appeal to the prurient interest. The second standard of

[1]Article V, Section 3(b)(1), Florida Constitution.

[2]418 U.S. 87, 94 S.Ct. 2887, 41 L.Ed.2d 590 (1974).

[3]413 U.S. 15, 93 S.Ct. 2607, 37 L.Ed.2d 419 (1973).

[4]418 U.S. 153, 94 S.Ct. 2751, 41 L.Ed.2d 642 (1974).

[5]354 U.S. 476, 77 S.Ct. 1304, 1 L.Ed.2d 1498 (1959).

[6]*A Book Named "John Cleland's Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure" v. Attorney General*, 383 U.S. 413, 86 S.Ct. 975, 16 L.Ed.2d 1 (1966).

obscenity as required in *Miller* and previously established in "Memoirs" is whether the magazines depicted or described, in a patently offensive way, sexual conduct specifically defined by the applicable state law, as written or construed (in the instant case Section 847.011, Florida Statutes). The third and final standard established by *Miller* is whether the magazines, each taken as a whole, lack serious literary, artistic, political or scientific value. In passing, we note that *Miller* has rejected as a constitutional standard the "Memoirs" test of "*utterly* without redeeming social value."

Accordingly, in view of the recent opinions of the United States Supreme Court in *Hamling* and in *Jenkins*, *supra*, the judgment of the trial court is reversed and remanded for further proceedings in which the *Miller* standards, as reviewed briefly above, may be applied.

It is so ordered.

ADKINS, C.J., ROBERTS, McCAIN, OVERTON and ENGLAND, JJ., Concur

U.S. LAW WEEK, 43 L.W. 3571

(JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS
APRIL 21, 1975
ORDERS OF THE COURT . . .)

74-857. Bucolo v. Florida. The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted and the judgment is reversed. Jenkins v. Georgia, 418 U.S. 157 (1974) and Kois v. Wisconsin, 408 U.S. 229 (1972).

(CORRECTED OPINION OF DEC. 9, 1974)

CORRECTED COPY
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA
JULY TERM, A.D. 1974
MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1974

CASE NO. 38,280
WILLIAM BUCOLO,

Appellant,

v.
STATE OF FLORIDA,

Appellee.

CASE NO. 38,279
RONALD A. SIMPSON,

Appellant,

v.
STATE OF FLORIDA,

Appellee.

CASE NO. 38,278
JAMES R. AGUT,

Appellant,

v.
STATE OF FLORIDA,

Appellee.

CASE NO. 38,424
WILLIAM BUCOLO and
JAMES R. AGUT,

Appellants,

v.
STATE OF FLORIDA,

Appellee.

CIRCUIT COURT CASE NO. 68 M 3538

Opinion filed October 16, 1974

Appeals from the Circuit Court, Criminal Division, in and for Palm Beach County, Donald P. Kohl, Judge

Richard Yale Feder; Irma Robbins Feder; Alfred I. Hopkins and Allan V. Everard, for Appellants

Earl Faircloth, Attorney General; and Raymond L. Marky, Assistant Attorney General, for Appellee

PER CURIAM.

In these consolidated appeals, appellants contest their convictions of violation of Section 847.011, Florida Statutes, commonly referred to as the Florida obscenity statute. Dispositive of our Court having jurisdiction was the trial judge's specific ruling upholding the constitutionality of that statute. We do. Article V, §3(b)(1), Florida Constitution.

Appellants attack the constitutionality of the statute vel non and as applied to both the materials involved and as applied to each of them.

The record is before us, as well as the appellate briefs,

Further
/Oral argument would serve no useful purpose, and therefore is hereby dispensed with.

After review of the record and briefs, and upon the construction, rationale and authority of (1) State of Flor-

ida v. Papp, Nos. 44,461 and 44,481, opinion filed June 12, 1974, with rehearing denied September 5, 1974; (2) State v. Reese, 222 So.2d 732 (Fla. 1969) and (3) Rhodes v. State, 283 So.2d 351 (Fla. 1973), the judgment of the trial court is hereby affirmed.

It is so ordered.

ADKINS, C.J., ROBERTS, McCAIN and DEKLE, JJ., Concur

ERVIN, J., Dissents

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
DEC 2 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

NO. 75-369

WILLIAM BUCOLO, ET AL.,

Petitioners,

-vs-

JAMES ADKINS, CHIEF JUSTICE, ET AL.,

Respondents.

RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

ROBERT L. SHEVIN
Attorney General

RAYMOND L. MARKY
Assistant Attorney General
The Capitol
Tallahassee, FL 32304

Counsel for Respondents

TOPICAL INDEX

	Page
OPINION BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
QUESTION PRESENTED	2
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES INVOLVED	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
REASONS WHY THE MOTION SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED	4
CONCLUSION	8
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	9

TABLE OF CITATIONS

	Page
Cardinale v. Louisiana, 394 U.S. 437 (1969)	4,7
Jenkins v. Georgia, 418 U.S. 157 (1974)	3
Kois v. Wisconsin, 408 U.S. 229 (1972)	3

OTHER AUTHORITY

	Page
Rule 3.191, F.R.Cr.P	2,3

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

No. 75-369

WILLIAM BUCOLO, et al.,

Petitioners,

-vs-

JAMES ADKINS, CHIEF JUSTICE, et al.,

Respondents.

RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR LEAFE TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Comes Now, Respondents in the above-styled cause pursuant to this Court's Order of October 30, 1975, and files this their response to the motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus filed by Petitioners.

OPINION BELOW

The opinion rendered by the Supreme Court of Florida referred to on page three of Petitioner's motion is accepted as being accurate.

JURISDICTION

For the reasons stated hereinabove, Respondents respectfully suggest Petitioners have failed to establish the requisite jurisdiction authorizing the relief prayed for.

QUESTION PRESENTED

Can Petitioners present to this Court by way of writ of mandamus a question not presented to the Florida Supreme Court?

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES INVOLVED

Respondents respectfully submit that the constitutional provisions and the statutes cited by Petitioners are not involved in this cause; however, Rule 3.191(g), Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure is. Said rule provides:

> Effect of Mistrial; Order of New Trial. A person who is to be tried again shall be brought to trial within 90 days from the date of declaration of a mistrial by the trial court, the date of an order by the trial court granting a new trial, the date of an order by the trial court granting a motion in arrest of judgment, or the date of receipt by the trial court of a mandate, order, or notice of whatever form from an appellate or other reviewing court which makes possible a new trial for the defendant, whichever is last in time.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Respondents accept the Statement of the Case as stated in paragraphs one through four of Petitioners' brief found on pages five and six of the motion.

In addition, Respondents would assert that subsequent to rendition of the Supreme Court's Order on July 9, 1975, Petitioners made no attempt to have that Order modified although the rules of the Supreme Court authorize the filing of petitions for rehearing. In this regard there is no question but that this Court in reversing Petitioners' conviction on April 21, 1975, by referring to Jenkings v. Georgia, 418 U.S. 157 (1974) and Kois v. Wisconsin, 408 U.S. 229 (1972), conclusively determined that the materials disseminated by petitioners were not obscene as a matter of law. The undersigned acknowledges that in view of this ruling the Petitioners could not be reprosecuted. Respondents would submit, however, that it was incumbent upon Petitioners to bring this matter to the attention of the Florida Supreme Court so that a ruling could have been made.

In paragraph five, Petitioners state that the relief from further prosecution can only be obtained in this Court. Respondents would suggest that such is not the case. First, Petitioners could have filed a motion to quash the information in the trial court on the grounds that this Court authoritatively and conclusively determined the matter. Additionally, under Rule 3.191, Florida Rules of Criminal

Procedure, (Florida's Speedy Trial Rule) the state must initiate prosecution within 90 days from the date the mandate of the appellate court is received by the trial court. Of course, if prosecution is not commenced within that time, the defendant is discharged from the crime and prosecution is barred. The petition establishes that the Florida Supreme Court's mandate was handed down on July 24, 1975, and mathematical calculation shows the time for reprosecution has expired. As a consequence, there can be no trial of Petitioners by the State of Florida. Moreover, on November 4, 1975, pursuant to the instructions of the undersigned, the duly elected state attorney in and for Palm Beach County, Florida, nolle prossed the charges lodged against Petitioners. (Appendix I)

REASONS WHY THE MOTION SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED

As has heretofore been noted, following rendition of the Florida Supreme Court's decision on July 9, 1975, Petitioners did not attempt to raise the issue presented herein by way of filing a petition for rehearing. Moreover, they did not raise this issue in the trial court by moving to dismiss the information after the mandate had been issued. As a consequence, the issue now presented to this Court has never been presented to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This Court in Cardinale v. Louisiana, 394 U.S. 437 (1969) clearly established that under such circumstances it was

without jurisdiction to entertain the merits of the federal claims first raised on appeal in this Court. The Court clearly and unequivocally held:

> "Although certiorari was granted to consider this question, the fact emerged in oral argument that the sole federal question argued here had never been raised, preserved, or passed upon in the state courts below. It was very early established that the Court will not decide federal constitutional issues raised here for the first time on review of state court decisions. In Crowell v. Randell, 10 Pet 368, 9 L.Ed 458 (1836), Justice Story reviewed the earlier cases commencing with Owings v Norwood's Lessee, 5 Cranch 344, 3 L Ed 120 (1809), and came to the conclusion that the Judiciary Act of 1789, c 20, §25, 1 Stat. 85, vested this Court with no jurisdiction unless a federal question was raised and decided in the state court below. 'If both of these do not appear on the record, the appellate jurisdiction fails.' 10 Pet 368, 391, 9 L Ed 458, 467. The Court has consistently refused to decide federal constitutional issues raised here for the first time on review of state court decisions both before the Crowell opinion, Miller v. Nicholls, 4 Wheat 311, 315, 4 L Ed 578, 579 (1819), and since, e. g. Safeway Stores, Inc. v. Oklahoma Retail Grocers Assn.,

Inc., 360 US 334, 342, n. 7, 3 L Ed 2d 1280, 1286, 79 S Ct 1196 (1959); State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co v. Duel, 324 US 154, 160-163, 89 L Ed 812, 817-819, 65 S Ct 573 (1945); McGoldrick v. Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, 309 US 430, 434-435, 84 L Ed 849, 851-852, 60 S Ct 670 (1940); Whitney v. California, 274 US 357, 362-363, 71 L Ed 1095, 1100-1101, 47 S Ct 641 (1927); Dewey v. Des Moines, 173 US 193, 197-201, 43 L Ed 665, 667-668, 19 S Ct 379 (1899); Murdock v. City of Memphis, 20 Wall 590, 22 L Ed 429 (1875).

"In addition to the question of jurisdiction arising under the statute controlling our power to review final judgments of state courts, 28 USC §1257, there are sound reasons for this. Questions not raised below are those on which the record is very likely to be inadequate, since it certainly was not compiled with those questions in mind. And in a federal system it is important that state courts be given the first opportunity to consider the applicability of state statutes in light of constitutional challenge, since the statutes may be construed in a way which saves their constitutionality. Or the issue may be blocked by an adequate state ground. Even though States

are not free to avoid constitutional issues on inadequate state grounds, O'Connor v Ohio, 385 US 92, 17 L Ed 2d 189, 87 S Ct 252 (1966), they should be given the first opportunity to consider them."

For the reasons stated above and on the authority of Cardinale v. Louisiana, this Court is without jurisdiction to consider the federal question tendered.

Moreover, in light of the failure of the State to comply with the speedy trial rule renders it impossible for Petitioners to be subjected to a second trial and action by this Court is therefore unnecessary to prevent the alleged injury anticipated by Petitioners.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated hereinabove, this Court should deny the petition for writ of mandamus.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT L. SHEVIN
Attorney General

RAYMOND L. MARKY
Assistant Attorney General
The Capitol
Tallahassee, FL 32304

Counsel for Respondents

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Response to Motion for Leave to File Petition for Writ of Mandamus has been forwarded to

Richard Yale Feder and
Irma Robbins Feder
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
110 N. Hibiscus Drive
Miami Beach, FL 33139

Alfred I. Hopkins
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
1701 Meridian Avenue
Miami Beach, FL 33139

Allan B. Everard
c/oA.C.L.U. of Florida
1207 Harvey Building
West Palm Beach, FL 33401

via U. S. Mail, this day of November, 1975.

Raymond L. Marky
Assistant Attorney General

APPENDIX

IN THE COUNTY COUR , CRIMINAL DIVISION
IN AND FOR PALM BE CH CO UNTY, FLORIDA

Memor ndum

STATE OF FLORIDA

vs.

JAMES R. AGUT; ROMEO RIVARD; WILLIAM BUCOLO; RONALD A. SIMPSON; ARTHUR RICHARD AXELMAN; GORDON STEWART CHESSER & PAT A KELLY

CASE NO. 68M-3538 DIV. County

INFORMATION FOR

PUBLISHING OR CAUSING TO BE PUBLISHED AN OBSCENE AND INDECENT COMIC STRIP, PICTURES OR DRAWINGS CONTAINED IN A NEWSPAPER.....
(2 counts)

NO BILL

NOLLE PROSSE

ISSUE ALIAS CAPIAS

ISSUE PLURIES CAPIAS

PLACE ON ABSENTEE DOCKET

(Circle One)

The above entitled case: NOLLE PROSSE

REASON:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES REMANDED THIS CASE UNDER GUIDELINES OF MILLER V. CALIFORNIA. THIS CASE NOLLE PROSSED USING PROSECUTORIAL DISCRETION REGARDING ITS AGE AND LOCATION OF WITNESSES.

(Additional Information in State Attorney's work file)

This 4th day of November , 19 75

RECEIVED
NOV 6 1975
ATTORNEY GENERALS OFFICE

DAVID H. BLUDWORTH
State Attorney
Palm Beach County, Florida

By [redacted]

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
DEC 9 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

No. 75-369, Misc.

WILLIAM BUCOLO, RONALD SIMPSON and JAMES R. AGUT, *Petitioners,*

vs.

JAMES ADKINS, CHIEF JUSTICE, JOSEPH BOYD, B. K. ROBERTS, BEN OVERTON and ARTHUR ENGLAND, JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA and DONALD P. KOHL, JUDGE OF THE PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA CIRCUIT COURT, CRIMINAL DIVISION, *Respondents.*

PETITIONERS' REPLY TO RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

ALFRED I. HOPKINS
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
1701 Meridian Ave.
Miami Beach, Florida 33139

ALLAN B. EVERARD
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
P.O. Box 9035
Riviera Beach, Florida 33404

RICHARD YALE FEDER
and
IRMA ROBBINS FEDER
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
110 N. Hibiscus Drive
Miami Beach, Florida 33139

Attorneys for Petitioners

MIAMI REVIEW — 371-4853 — 377-3721

in the

Supreme Court

of the

United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

No. 75-369, Misc.

WILLIAM BUCOLO, RONALD SIMPSON
and JAMES R. AGUT,

Petitioners,

vs.

JAMES ADKINS, CHIEF JUSTICE, JOSEPH BOYD, B. K. ROBERTS, BEN OVERTON and ARTHUR ENGLAND, JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA and DONALD P. KOHL, JUDGE OF THE PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA CIRCUIT COURT, CRIMINAL DIVISION,

Respondents.

PETITIONERS' REPLY TO RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Respondent - State of Florida's restatement of the Question Presented as whether or not "Petitioners can present to this Court by way of mandamus a question not presented to the Florida Supreme Court?" is misleading and fallacious. The true question presented, as stated in Petitioners' Motion (p. 4), is "Whether the Florida Supreme Court's reversal of the obscenity convictions below *accompanied by remand* 'to the trial Court for further proceedings in which the standards established in *Miller v. California* can be applied' violates the Order and Mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case at bar."

Obviously, the significant question involves the *clear meaning of this Court's Order and Mandate*, and this has not only been presented already to the Florida Supreme Court, but their remanding the matter for a new trial represents a plainly erroneous decision. Certainly, the unambiguous meaning of *this* Court's Order and Mandate is a question peculiarly appropriate for *this* Court's decision as part and parcel of this Court's proper exercise of jurisdiction.

Respondent - State of Florida *concedes error* by admitting that "there is no question but that this [United States Supreme] Court in reversing Petitioners' conviction on April 21, 1975, by referring to *Jenkins v. Georgia*, 418 U.S. 157 (1974) and *Kois v. Wisconsin*, 408 U.S. 229 (1972), conclusively determined that the materials disseminated by Petitioners were not obscene as a matter of law." (Response, p. 3)

Respondent argues that Petitioners should have filed a petition for rehearing or similar paper to bring this

matter to the attention of the Florida Supreme Court. In the first place, petitions for rehearing are purely optional in Florida. Second, *Respondent's* duty to seek justice should have required them to petition for rehearing, if they felt such was necessary, once Respondent saw the error of their ways and admitted that it had been conclusively determined that the materials in question are not obscene under our Federal Constitution.

Respondent's argument that Petitioners could have filed a Motion to Quash the Information in the trial Court below is ingenious, but ingenuous. To suggest that an *additional* six or seven years of appellate proceedings in the Florida Courts, under the circumstances involved, seems peculiarly inappropriate (see Petition for Certiorari and Supporting Brief previously filed).

Florida's Speedy Trial Rule, if used by Petitioners to secure relief, as Respondent argues, would not be an adjudication on the merits, an adjudication made by *this* Court but unrecognized by the Florida Supreme Court.

Indeed, the "Nolle Prosse" filed by the Palm Beach State Attorney in the trial court on November 4, 1975 (*after* Petitioners' Mandamus Motion was filed in this Court), gives the following as its Reason: "SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES REMANDED THIS CASE UNDER GUIDELINES OF MILLER V. CALIFORNIA. THIS CASE NOLLE PROSSED USING *PROSECUTORIAL DISCRETION REGARDING ITS AGE AND LOCATION OF WITNESSES.*" (See Response, Appendix, emphasis supplied.) Petitioners are again denied the favorable adjudication on the merits (of the materials in question as *not* obscene and of their

criminal convictions as *not* Constitutionally valid) to which Petitioners are entitled under *this* Court's Order and Mandate. Instead, they are offered half-hearted non-prosecutions. Anything less than the full exoneration to which this Court's summary reversal entitled them would be unjust and unfair.

The fact of Petitioners' criminal convictions below can be raised during the remainder of their lifetimes as a blot on their records and a dishonor to them and their families.

A definitive Order by this Court, to which even Respondent admits the Petitioners are entitled *substantively*, would be far preferable to carrying copies of this Court's Order and Mandate, and copies of Respondent's Response to the effect that the Order and Mandate conclusively establish the lack of obscenity of the materials Petitioners disseminated, and copies of the *Nolle Prosse* filed in the trial court to future employers, graduate schools, etc. in order to establish their innocence.

In view of the incredibly protracted, complicated and prejudicial proceedings in the within matter, justice demands an end, not a new beginning.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Petitioners pray that this Court grant the Petition for Writ of Mandamus for the reasons expressed herein and in the original Petition for Writ of Mandamus.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD YALE FEDER and
IRMA ROBBINS FEDER
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
110 N. Hibiscus Drive
Miami Beach, Florida 33139

ALFRED I. HOPKINS
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
1701 Meridian Avenue
Miami Beach, Florida 33139

ALLAN B. EVERARD
c/o A.C.L.U. of Florida
P.O. Box 9035
Riviera Beach, Florida 33404

Attorneys for Petitioners

By _____
IRMA ROBBINS FEDER